

THOMPSON COBURN**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****MAY 25 2005***Thompson Coburn LLP
Attorneys at Law*One US Bank Plaza
St. Louis, Missouri 63101-1693
314-552-6000
FAX 314-552-7000
www.thompsoncoburn.com**Facsimile****FOR IMMEDIATE DELIVERY**

To	Firm Name	Phone	Fax
Examiner: TRINH, Minh N.	USPTO	703-305-2887	703-872-9306

From: Joseph M. Rolnicki

Date: 05/25/2005

Message:

Atty/Client/Matter No.: 3076/60034/09085

Total Number of Pages, including this page: 3

If you do not receive all of the pages, please call 314-552-6286 as soon as possible.

Thank you,

Fax Department - Operator: 02Time of Transmittal: 2:39 A.M./P.M.**Confidentiality Note**


The information contained in this facsimile transmission is legally privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this transmission is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify us by collect telephone call and return the original transmission to us at the above address by U.S. mail. Thank you.

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****MAY 25 2005**

Docket No. 60034-9085

PATENT**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE****CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the Commissioner for Patents at (703) 872-9306 on May 25, 2005.


Joseph M. Rolnicki
Reg. No. 32,653

In re application of: Peters, et al. :

Serial No.: 10/055,291

: Examiner: TRINH, Minh N.

Filed: January 23, 2002

: Group Art Unit: 3729

For: Method of Attaching an Electric
Conductor to an Electrically
Conductive Terminal via a
Telescoping Sleeve

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REQUEST FOR TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

A telephone interview discussing the Final Rejection of claims 1-3, 7, 8, 12-15, 17, and 19 of the application is requested.

More specifically, a proposed amendment of claim 1, replacing "the method comprising:" in line 4 with --the method comprising steps in the order of:-- is to be presented in the interview. Based on comments made in the last Office Action, it is

3136117

believed that such an amendment of claim 1 would put the application into condition for allowance.

Furthermore, the objection to claim 1 is to be discussed. In the objection it is stated that it is unclear as to whether the steps set forth in claim 1 are occurring one after another. It is contended that the use of the word "then" does not clearly define whether the order of steps is in the sequential order as listed.


It is submitted that the use of the word "then" in claim 1 clearly sets forth the order of the steps. This is in accordance with the clear understanding of the definition of the word "then". Webster's 9th Edition Collegiate Dictionary defines "then" as "soon after that: next in order of time", and "following next after in order of position, narration, or enumeration: being next in a series".

According to any definition of the word "then", the sequence of steps set forth in claim 1 is clear, and this sequence of steps is not suggested in the prior art as explained in the Remarks presented in Amendment and Response B.

It is again requested that a telephone interview be conducted to discuss the above issues, which are believed to put the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Thompson Coburn LLP

By: 
Joseph M. Rolnicki
Reg. No. 32,653
One US Bank Plaza
St. Louis, MO 63101-1693
(314) 552-6286